SUBJECTS.

122. *Right of interpellation in the Legislative Council.*

The same member requested—

that the right of interpellation might be conferred on the non-official members of the Legislative Council—a right enjoyed by their brethren in all similarly constituted councils in British India. This, he said, would give the people a ready and constitutional means of bringing their grievances to the notice of the authorities as well as enable the Government to make declarations of policy or reasons inducing them to take particular lines of action and thus avoid unnecessary discussion in the Press.

Dewan.—Why should the power be given to the Legislative Council? This Assembly is more representative and contains a much larger number of members than the Council.

Member.—It will be exercised by the non-official members with greater discretion.

Dewan.—I do not think that the members of this Assembly are incapable of exercising the power with equal discretion.

Member.—The Council meets oftener than the Assembly which meets only once a year.

Dewan's reply.—The Council also does not meet very frequently. Apart from that, however, the power is given to the Legislative Councils in British India because there the people have no other means of getting their grievances and wants placed before the governing body directly by their representatives. This Assembly which is more representative in its character has this privilege already and instead of four or five members interpellating the Government in the Legislative Council, all the hundred members of this selected body have power to put questions and they already know they have the power and have not used it very sparingly. We have here not only member or members of the Executive Government but all the Heads of Departments as well. I tell you this simply to show that the analogy set up between British India and Travancore does not hold good in this respect. As we have another instrument for attaining the object in view, and a more efficient instrument, I do not see the necessity for the right being conferred on the non-official members of the Legislative Council. They are not, moreover, a representative body. The annual meeting of the Assembly affords full scope for questions being put on all subjects connected with the Administration.

The same member urged—

that qualified citizens living within the municipal

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

123. *Election of members to the Towns Improvement Committees.*

limits of Towns might be authorized to elect a fair proportion of the non-official members of the Towns Improvement Committees. This would make local self-government a reality and enable the public to have a voice in municipal administration—the training ground for higher forms of Representative Government.

Dewan's reply.—The Municipalities Bill will provide for this.

The same member represented—

124. *The Civil Courts and the High Court Regulations Amendment Bills.*

that the principles underlying the Bills to amend the Civil Courts Regulation and the High Court Regulation were not wholly acceptable to the public. He pointed out that the raising of the small cause jurisdiction of Munsiffs from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 was likely to result in miscarriage of justice and suggested that the delegation of such jurisdiction up to Rs. 20 to the Provertikar or other Village judiciary as in British India would be the best method of lightening the work of the Munsiffs. He observed that the proposal to have two classes of Munsiffs with jurisdictions up to Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000 was unnecessary and unsound and opposed to all British Indian precedents. There was no necessity, he remarked, for the creation of a new class of Subordinate Judges. The reduction in the number of Judges in the High Court from four to three was likely to weaken public confidence especially in the adjudication of important civil and criminal appeals.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

The same member requested—

125. *Enactment for partition in Marumakkathayom Tarwads.*

that an enactment might be introduced for arresting the growing evil of litigiousness in Marumakkathayom Tarwads and for affording facilities for partition. The law of inheritance and succession had not kept pace with the progress of society during the last three or four decades and the conflict between the two had, he observed, brought about a state of affairs not far removed from chronic litigiousness leading to utter ruin. He said that it was the duty of Government to harmonize law with the altered conditions of society. As the question affected the welfare of the bulk of the population, he suggested that a Commission might be appointed to enquire into the subject and report on it.

Mr. Krishnan Pandala (Member, Quilon Taluk) in supporting the suggestion dwelt on the causes which had brought about the deplorable state of affairs. They were, he said,

(1) the theory that no Marumakkathayom Tarwads of whatever number of collateral branches it might consist and whatever be its mode of life was in law compulsorily partible, and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly